REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-45 are pending. Claims 1-45 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 11, 17, 21, 24, 26, 30, 32, 34, 38, 40, 42, and 44 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,854,112 to Crespo et al. ("Crespo") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,249,354 to Tigani et al. ("Tigani") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,066,182 to Wilde et al. ("Wilde").

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include "automatically searching in a plurality of locations for a configuration information that includes one or more parameters to configure the software that includes searching for a first portion of the configuration information at a first location <u>based on a first identification of the data processing system</u>; continuing the searching in one or more second locations for a second portion of the configuration information <u>based on a second identification of the data processing system</u>." (emphasis added)

The Examiner stated that "the combination of Crespo and Tigani does not disclose searching for a first portion of the configuration information at a first location; and continuing the searching in one or more second locations for a second portion of the configuration information."(Office Action, p. 3).

Accordingly, a combination of Crespo and Tigani fails to disclose searching for a first portion of the configuration information at a first location <u>based on a first identification of the data processing system</u>; and continuing searching in one or more second locations for a second portion of the configuration information <u>based on a second identification of the data processing system</u>, as recited in amended claim 1.

Wilde discloses deploying a software build from a plurality of software builds to a target computer. More specifically, Wilde discloses the following:

> The method includes providing both <u>an operating system configuration file and a personalization parameters file in the memory</u>…The apparatus includes an operating system configuration file for storing personalization parameters with which the operating system configures itself during an installation. The apparatus also includes a personalization parameters file stored in the memory…

> (Wilde, col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 22)(emphasis added)

Thus, Wilde discloses an operating system configuration file and a personalization parameters file in the memory. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to searching for a first portion of the configuration information at a first location <u>based on a first identification of the data processing system</u>; and continuing searching in one or more second locations for a second portion of the configuration information <u>based on a second identification of the data processing system</u>.

Furthermore, even if Wilde, Crespo, and Tigani were combined, such a combination would still lack searching for a first portion of the configuration information at a first location <u>based on a first identification of the data processing system</u>; and continuing searching in one or more second locations for a second portion of the configuration information <u>based on a second identification of the data processing system</u>, as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Crespo, in view of Tigani, and further in view of Wilde.

Given that claims 2-45 contain limitations that are similar to those limitations set forth above with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-45 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Crespo, in view of Tigani, and further in view of Wilde.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 022666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 9, 2009   _____/Tatiana Rossin/_____

Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No. 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Fax (408) 720-8383

Customer No. 045217